



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,770	11/20/2003	Ling Tony Chen	13768.810.62	8379
47973 7590 06/18/2008 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER SHAN, APRIL YING	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/18/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/717,770	Applicant(s) CHEN, LING TONY	
	Examiner APRIL Y. SHAN	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,8,11,14,19-24 and 27-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 19-24 and 27-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicant's amendment, filed 28 March, has been received, entered into the record, and respectfully and carefully considered.
2. As a result of the amendment, claims 14 and 20-24 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 19-24 and 27-33 are now presented for examination.
3. Any objections or rejections not repeated below for record are withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 19-24 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As per **claims 1-2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 19-24 and 27-33**, "an untrusted entity" and "a trusted entity" are being recited. The examiner respectfully and carefully reviewed the Applicant's original disclosure, for example, in all the figures of the current application, only "a client" and "a server" are being recited. There are no indication of either a client or a server is untrusted or trusted. The examiner finds no support in the original disclosure about "an untrusted entity" and "a trusted entity".

Art Unit: 2135

Further, some other limitations such as singer identification for the untrusted entity is not supported by the disclosure either. Is it server's signer identification or client's signer identification?

Furthermore "(f) the trusted entity utilizing they key...to generate a temporary signature..." is being recited in claim 1. The examiner respectfully and carefully reviewed the Applicant's original disclosure, in particular page 14 of the original disclosure and this newly added claim limitation is not supported/defined in the original disclosure. The disclosure discloses "the server computes the signature using a HMAC" and it is not a temporary signature. Please clarify.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 11, 19-24 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prasad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,152).

As per **claim 1**, Prasad et al. discloses a method for ensuring that data generated by an untrusted entity, comprising a first computing device, and subsequently stored in a persistent storage of the untrusted entity have not been modified when the data are subsequently accessed for use by the untrusted entity, comprising steps of:

(a) the untrusted entity ("Clerk Validation Terminal (CVT) 106" – e.g. col. 4, lines 2-3.

Please note CVT corresponds to Applicant's untrusted entity) sending first data related information to

the trusted entity for signature computation (e.g. col. 6, lines 60-66);

(b) a trusted entity ("main processor in conjunction with the network central database" – e.g. col. 6, lines 61-62. Please note main processor in conjunction with the network central database correspond to Applicant's trusted entity) comprising a second computing device, employing a key that is only known and available for use by the trusted entity, to compute a signature for the first data related information before the data are stored in the persistent storage by the untrusted entity (e.g. col. 7, lines 34-40);

(c) the trusted entity sending the signature to the untrusted entity for storage (e.g. col. 8, lines 52-55);

(d) storing the signature and the data in the persistent storage of the untrusted entity (e.g. col. 8, lines 52-55);

(e) before the data that were stored are subsequently used by the client untrusted entity, the untrusted entity sending second data related information to the trusted entity to verify that the data that were stored have not been changed (e.g. col. 8, line 66 – col. 9, line 10);

(f) the trusted entity utilizing the key that is only known and available for use by the trusted entity to generate a temporary signature of the second data related information sent to the trusted entity (e.g. claim 1);

(g) comparing the temporary signature to the stored signature (e.g. claim 1); and

(h) only using the data that were stored if the step of indicates that the signatures match and that the data that were stored have not been changed since the signature was computed before storing the data and the signature (e.g. col. 10, lines 1-3).

Please further note discloses a gaming network, in which a transaction signature is generated each time the user completes a transaction on a gaming machine (e.g. abstract) and in col. 1, lines 25-58, "...each time a user completes a transaction on a gaming machine, the network stores the transaction information...", which met the new claim limitation of "game session related" in the amended claims 20-24.

As per **claim 2**, Prasad et al. further discloses wherein the first data related information is the same as the data and the second data related information is the same as the stored data (e.g. col. 8, line 66 – col. 9, line 10 and claim 1).

As per **claims 5 and 8**, Prasad et al. further discloses wherein the first data related information comprises a digest of the data and the second data related information comprises a digest of the stored data wherein the digests are calculated by the untrusted entity based on the data and stored data (e.g. col. 8, lines 1-12. Please note a **cyclic redundancy check (CRC)** is a type of function that takes as input a data stream of any length and produces as output a value of a certain fixed size. The term CRC is often used to denote either the function or the function's output. A CRC can be used as a checksum to detect accidental alteration of data during transmission or storage. A checksum is same as message digest) and a signer identification (ID) for the untrusted entity, the signer ID uniquely indicating the untrusted entity and not being controlled by an operator of the untrusted entity (e.g. col. 6, lines 25-28. Please note validation number 206 corresponds to Applicant's signer ID);

As per **claim 11**, Prasad et al. further discloses wherein the data comprise a plurality of different sets of data, further comprising the steps of:

- (a) obtaining a signer identification (ID) for the untrusted entity, the signer ID uniquely indicating the untrusted entity and not being controlled by an operator of the untrusted entity (e.g. col. 6, lines 25-28. Please note validation number 206 corresponds to Applicant's signer ID);
- (b) on the trusted entity, using the key for computing an intermediate key from a concatenation of an arbitrary value and the signer ID (e.g. col. 7, lines 17-33, col. 8, lines 37-43);
- (c) sending the intermediate key from the trusted entity to the untrusted entity (e.g. col. 8, lines 52-55);
- (d) using the intermediate key to sign each set of the data to produce the signature for the set of data (e.g. col. 6, lines 54-66); and
- (e) storing the signature, the arbitrary value, and the signer ID on the persistent storage (e.g. col. 8, lines 52-55).

As per **claim 19**, Prasad et al. disclose method of steps as applied above in claim 1. Therefore, Prasad et al. discloses the claimed machine readable instructions stored on a memory medium for carrying out the method of steps.

As per **claims 21 and 29**, they are rejected using the same rationale of rejecting claim 5 above.

As per **claims 22 and 32**, they are rejected using the same rationale of rejecting claim 8 above.

As per **claims 20, 27-28**, they are rejected using the same rationale of rejecting claim 1 above.

As per **claims 23 and 30**, they are rejected using the same rationale of rejecting claim 11 above.

As per **claims 24, 31 and 33**, they are rejected using the same rationale of rejecting claims 1, 5 and 8 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,152) and further in view of Peinado (U.S. Patent No. 7,073,063).

As per **claim 14**, Prasad et al. does not expressly disclose the step of determining if the signer ID that was received from the untrusted entity is on a list of banned signer IDs, and if so, indicating in the result that the set of data are not usable by the untrusted entity. However, this well known feature is disclosed in Peinado (col. 18, line 55 – col. 19, line 3). It would have been obvious to a person with

ordinary skill in the art to combine such well known feature disclosed in Peinado with Prasad et al since it helps to protect "information security for gaming machine networks", as disclosed by Prasad et al. (e.g. col. 1, lines 5-8).

Response to Argument

11. Applicant's arguments filed 28 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. The Applicant's remarks/arguments are summarized as below:

a. Claim 11 has been amended (page 11)

b. Withdraw 112 1st rejection (pages 11-12)

c. Prasad fails to disclose the key is known only to the trusted entity, the key being used used to compute the signature or what entity has knowledge of the key, the signature stored at the untrusted entity in claims 1, 19, 20 and 27.

In response to remark/argument a), the examiner respectfully points out according to Applicant's amendment to the claims dated 28 March, 2008, claim 14 has been amended, not claim 11.

In response to remark/argument b), the examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains the rejection. In the response, Applicant's general response on page 11 does not specifically point out where these supports are in the original disclosure. Further, on page 12, the argument of "since the term server is short for trusted entity, there is support for the trusted entity computing a temporary signature", is misleading. The original disclosure never explicit/implicit equals trusted entity with server, the argument is deemed not persuasive and therefore, the rejection is maintained.

In response to remark/argument c), the examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains the rejection. Prasad discloses in col. 7, lines 34-40, "...Preferably, it is a technique that cannot be readily discerned from the other information stored with the signature...In some embodiments, a specific algorithm is used to translate the transaction information into the transaction signature", which met the claimed limitation of only the trusted entity know the key and the key being used to compute the signature or what entity has knowledge of the key. Please note the main processor in the central corresponds to Applicant's trusted entity. Please further note in col. 4, lines 2-3, "Clerk Validation Terminal (CVT) 106 corresponds to Applicant's untrusted entity. Furthermore, in col. 8, lines 23-55, "transaction information and transaction signature may also recorded in additional memory locations such as those found in a cluster controller or CVT, which met the claimed limitation of the signature stored at the untrusted entity.

Thus, contrary to Applicant's argument, Prasad indeed discloses the key is known only to the trusted entity, the key being used to compute the signature or what entity has knowledge of the key, the signature stored at the untrusted entity in claims 1, 19, 20 and 27.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

Art Unit: 2135

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to APRIL Y. SHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/April Y Shan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2135

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135